DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 047 073 UD 011 277

TITLE	The Failure of Academic High Schools in New York City.
INSTITUTION	Brooklyn Education Task Force, N.Y.
PUB DATE	Dec 70
NOTE	36p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Academic Education, College Preparation, Ethnic Groups, *High Schools, *Negro Students, Public Education, Public Schools, *Public School Systems, Puerto Ricans
IDENTIFIERS	Brooklyn Education Task Force, College Bound Program, *New York City

ABSTRACT

This report on the performance of academic high schools in New York City attempts to evaluate the public schools. It is pointed out that on a citywide basis, less than one out of two high school graduates receives an academic diploma. Predominantly black, predominantly Puerto Rican, and predominantly white schools share the failures. Apparently, dangerous overcrowding in most high schools does not seem to have a direct correlation with academic achievement; schools ranking among the highest in performance are among the most overcrowded, and schools ranking among the lowest in performance are among the most underutilized. In addition, "ethnic" schools, the academic diploma, and the situation in each city borough are discussed. Also discussed is the College Bound program. Tables of statistics on percentage of academic diplomas granted in 1969-70 and ethnic enrollment in each borough are included. (Author/JW)

THE FAILURE OF ACADEMIC HIGH SCHOOLS IN NEW YORK CITY

ED047073

UD011277

Brooklyn Education Task Force
525 Clinton Avenue
Brooklyn, New York 11238
Telephone No. 783-4485 or TR 4-0049

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I Introduction 1

II The Academic Diploma 3

III The Report on Graduates 4

IV The 80% Failure Rate 5

V More Students, Fewer Graduates 6

VI The School "Ethnic" 7

VII Schools Are So Overcrowded That Teachers Can't Teach 9

VIII Enrollment Versus Attendance 11

IX A Word About Brooklyn 11

X A Word About Manhattan 12

XI A Word About Queens 13

XII A Word About The Bronx 13

XIII A Word About Staten Island (Richmond) 14

XIV A Provocative Perspective 14

XV The College Bound Gravy Train 15

XVI The Following Tables 18

Tables:

Table U-2 Academic High Schools
Comparison of the Five High Schools in Each Borough Having the Highest Building Utilization Rate With the Percentage of Academic Diplomas Granted 1969-1970 School Year 19

Tables DG-1 to DG-5
Diplomas Granted Brooklyn 20
Diplomas Granted Manhattan 21
Diplomas Granted Queens 22
Diplomas Granted Bronx 23
Diplomas Granted Staten Island 24

Tables ER-1 to ER-5
Ethnic Enrollment Brooklyn 25
Ethnic Enrollment Manhattan 27
Ethnic Enrollment Queens 28
Ethnic Enrollment Bronx 30
Ethnic Enrollment Staten Island 31

XVII Office of High Schools - Organization 32

INTRODUCTION

Following the original report on the failures of the Academic High Schools in Brooklyn, published by the Brooklyn Education Task Force in 1969, there have been several other inquiries made into the situation, the most penetrating of which was prepared by the Citizens Committee for Children. It has been two years since our original report was published. During these two years we have seen tremendous changes in the public's attitude towards the school system. In light of their new awareness and concern about the plight of the school system and its more than one million students, we took another look at the Academic High Schools, not just in Brooklyn but throughout the city.

When preparing a report of this nature one is dependent upon the whims of Board of Education officials to release pertinent data. For the most part the Central Headquarters staff is still as secretive as ever and tries its best to keep information from taxpayers, students and parents. Mr. Murray Bergtraum, President of the Board of Education, did his best, as usual, to discourage the release of public documents. His collusion with the Council of Supervisory Associations, and the High School Principal's Association, have made it extremely difficult to obtain any information on the high schools. This report concentrates on ethnic census data, school utilization data and the report on graduates receiving diplomas.

Despite the fact that we have been told (without the benefit of a detailed breakdown) that vast sums of money have been spent on improving the high schools, we find the situation is about as bad as it was two years ago. Today, on a citywide basis, less than one out of two graduates receives an academic diploma. Predominantly Black, predominantly Puerto Rican and predominantly White schools share the failures.

One of the most interesting findings is that the dangerous overcrowding in most high schools does not seem to have a direct correlation with academic achievement as most school officials assert. Schools ranking among the highest in performance are among the most overcrowded, and schools ranking among the lowest in performance are among the most underutilized. This area certainly needs more study but we can no longer accept the argument, used extensively by principlas, that their schools do poorly because of the overcrowding.

In his recent book Crisis in the Classroom, Charles Silberman quotes Charles E. Brown, former superintendent of the Newton, Massachusetts schools as saying:

> "Not too many of us realize how bad American Schools are from the point of view of humanity, respect, trust or dignity."

From our investigations in New York City High Schools we could add not too many people realize how bad the quality of education is either.

For their understanding and help in preparing the manuscript I would like to thank Susan Slesin, Richard Weston, and Sue Breslin. Rosalie Stutz was a source of inspiration and insight throughout the many months we spent preparing this report. For providing the will and determination necessary to complete a report of this kind I will forever thank my wife Judy.

Daniel Dobin
Clerk of the Works

December, 1970

THE ACADEMIC DIPLOMA

For many years, school administrators in New York City have tried to down play the importance of an acacemic diploma. But to prospective employers, civil service, college admissions officers and peers, the ticket anywhere is an academic diploma. In the Monthly Labor Review of April, 1968, an article appeared entitled "Education of Adult Workers in 1975" by Denis F. Johnson. The opening lines of that article were:

> "By 1975, the adult work force (25 years old and over) will include as many college graduates as those with 8 years of schooling or less. Less than a decade ago (in 1959), college graduates as a group in the work force were but one third the size of the other component."

(These statistics come from the Division of Labor Force Studies and the Bureau of Labor Statistics).

Furthermore, the U.S. Census Bureau in its Current Population Reports disclosed that not only do college graduates earn more than people with high-school diplomas, but that income rises for each year of schooling from elementary grades to graduate level.

> "A significant finding of the report is this: Income increases with age much faster for men who have higher levels of education. For example, earnings of high-school graduates of ages 25 through 34 average $7,533, while those of ages 55 through 64 average $8,414, or not quite 12 percent more. But among college graduates, the average for those 25 through 34 is $9,974, while for those 55 through 64 it is $16,959 - or 60 percent more.
>
> Over a lifetime. Estimated lifetime incomes from age 18 to death are: 8 years of school, $276,755; 4 years of high school, $371,094; 1 to 3 years of college, $424,280; 4 years or more of college, $607,921."

There are many families where an academic diploma is not looked upon with this much importance. However, for all those families, jobs, colleges and peers who do have higher educational goals and requirements, the Academic Diploma is a necessity. The acceptance of the Academic Diploma as the standard of achievement is so widespread now that you hear very little about reading scores in high school. What you do hear though, as the standard of achievement, is the number of graduates receiving Academic Diplomas.

For example the "Report on the New York City High Schools" published by the Citizens Committee for Children on January 5, 1970 makes the following observations about the importance of Academic Diplomas:

> "What the figures mean is that 63.4% of the students who entered the 1968 class either transferred or dropped out of school, or received diplomas intended primarily for students who do not plan to go to college. This last is a euphemism which can be taken as meaning that children got their bodies to school and kept them there for most of the time. It does not mean that they were touched and taught by our schools. For them, as for the drop outs, the future is dreary, with little hope for a decent job, or an opportunity for improvement."

REPORT ON GRADUATES

The Office of High Schools of the New York City Board of Education publishes a five-page mimiograph report entitled, "Report on Graduates." This report, along with other information, lists for every June and January graduation all of the Academic High Schools by borough and the number of graduates and diplomas they received. All of the tables and data used in this study and titled "Diplomas Granted" come directly

from this Official Board of Education source. The information contained in the "Report on Graduates" is of vital importance in determining how a particular high school is performing. Possibly because of its importance, this is not a widely circulated document. Most high school parent groups have yet to receive copies or even know that such information exists.

For the purpose of our report, the Specialized High Schools, requiring a special test or other entry requirement were not included. There are 63 academic high schools in New York City. Fifty-seven are reported on here; the remaining 6 include the specialized high schools and those high schools for which there is no data available.

THE 80% FAILURE RATE

In only 16 of the 57 academic high schools, did at least 1 out of 2 graduates receive an academic diploma. In other words, 41 high schools or 70% of the 57 high schools had graduating classes where less than half of those graduating received an academic diploma.

On a borough by borough comparison of the 16 schools we find that ten of them were in Queens and six in Brooklyn. In the boroughs of Manhattan, Bronx, and Richmond, every academic high school failed to graduate more than 1 out of 2 seniors with academic diplomas. It is particulary interesting to note that in Richmond, the senior class ethnic data shows the highest white population in the city, ranging from a high of 96.8% to a low of 85%.

Since very few high schools in other parts of the city approach the degree of "Whiteness" of the Staten Island schools, it is difficult to make comparisons, except with schools like New Utrecht (90%

white) and Lafayette (86% white) which have graduating classes where 38% and 50% respectively of the students receive academic diplomas. If one looks at the other end of the spectrum (schools with a low percentage of whites) the comparisons are indeed interesting. George Washington High School in Manhattan, for example, which Mr. Albert Shanker hysterically charges is on the receiving end of "an organized effort to bring about rule in the schools by violence" is only 27% white but grants 43% of its graduates academic diplomas. Likewise, DeWitt Clinton High School in the Bronx is 39% white with 45% of the graduates receiving academic diplomas. Both schools, although different from the Staten Island High Schools do better in the granting of academic diplomas to their graduates.

Futhermore, New Dorp High School on Staten Island with a senior class which is 96.8% white granted academic diplomas to barely 1 out of 3 graduates. New Dorp's candidates for graduation have the highest percentage of white students, yet achieve no better than non-white students in other high schools. There are 21 academic high schools in New York City where less than a third (1 out of 3) of the graduates receive academic diplomas. Even worse are the 9 Academic High Schools in New York City where fewer than 1 out of 5 graduates, an 80% failure rate, receive academic diplomas and a chance for college acceptance! The individual school figures can be found in Tables DG-1 to DG-5.

MORE STUDENTS, FEWER GRADUATES?

The total register of the academic high schools has grown from 192,400 in 1958 to 236,000 in 1969. These figures are reported in a

Board of Education publication, Trends in the Ethnic Composition of the Pupil Population of the New York City Schools prepared by the Bureau of Educational Programs, Research and Statistics. Given this general growth pattern in school population it is difficult to explain why fewer and fewer seniors are reported as candidates for graduation each year. From June 1968 to June 1970 alone, there was a drop of 1,370 candidates for graduation. Even though more students go to high school, fewer and fewer of them become candidates for graduation, in spite of the tremendous increase in operating costs of the high schools.

Futhermore, this will be one of the last years for which data of this nature will be available. The Office of High Schools has decided to abolish the three classifications of diplomas: Academic, General, and Commercial. Starting in June, 1973 only one kind of diploma will be granted. On the back of each diploma will be listed the courses taken, thereby assuring an even greater confusion and misunderstanding for parents. As usual, once the public begins to understand the tracking code, the "Professionals" find new ways to hide the facts.

THE SCHOOL "ETHNIC"

The School Ethnic Census data for October 31, 1969 indicates that the school system as a whole is about 44% white. But data collected on the same data indicates that the Academic High School senior class of the 1969-1970 school year was approximately 65% white. This points up the paradox in the New York City school system. As one looks at the various grades in the schools one can see that the higher you go the more white children there are until at the senior class level there is

an overwhelming majority of white students. This points up the collective failures of our schools. By the senior year the system discards all those both Black and White, whom it has deemed unteachable and unworthy and rewards those who remain. Yet, for the majority of students who somehow make it through the twelve year ordeal (65% of whom are white) the schools once again fail by only granting academic diplomas to less than half the candidates for graduation.

Tables ER-1 to ER-5 show the ethnic make up of the New York City high schools. All of the data comes from the Bureau of Educational Program Research and Statistics of the New York City Board of Education (located on the seventh floor of 110 Livingston Street). It has been our experience to have our inquiries and requests for information courteously answered by this bureau. Miss Florence Adler who is in charge of maintaining the ethnic census records is both knowledgeable and professional and tries her best to comply with all requests for ethnic census data. Each year the "Bureau" publishes a document called the Annual Census of School Population from data collected at each school on the last day of October. This year's document states, "this census represents the thirteenth city-wide effort of this kind." It is curious that last year's document also stated that it was the "thirteenth city-wide effort." Will the real thirteenth please stand up?

Aside from the fact that most Academic High Schools are racially segregated in the extreme sense of the word - all white or all black - there is one other interesting characteristic that is visible. No matter what percentage of whites there are in the high school as a

whole there are invariably higher percentages of whites in the graduating class. According to official figures the city-wide student population of the high schools, is 54% with the percentage of whites in the senior class city-wide being over 65%.

THE SCHOOLS ARE SO OVERCROWDED THAT TEACHERS CAN'T TEACH

For many years school administrators have convinced themselves and the taxpayers that one of the major reasons for pupil underachievement is the overcrowded school building. There is no argument that schools which are not bursting at the seams are preferable to those which are. We have found however, that there does not seem to be a pattern or correlation between overcrowding and underachievement. In Table U-2 on page 19 we have compared the building utilization rates of the most overcrowded high schools in each borough. This data, compiled by the School Planning and Research Division of the Board of Education, when compared with the "Report on Graduates" indicates that there is no identifiable relationship between overcrowding and underachievement per se. There are of course a majority of high schools which are dangerously overcrowded and show miserable performance. It should be noted that the percentage shown over 100% utilization means a school is that much more overcrowded.

It is incongruous that high schools like Midwood in Brooklyn which is at 145% utilization and whose senior class is 84% white, grants 71% of its graduates academic diplomas while Fort Hamilton, also in Brooklyn, at 148% utilization and whose senior class is also 84% white, grants only 31% of its graduates academic diplomas. Morris High School in the

Bronx with a reported 175% of utilization grants 15% of the graduates academic diplomas and Boys High in Brooklyn with 111% utilization grants even a lower percentage of academic diplomas - only 11%. These statistics show that achievement seems to have little to do with overcrowding. Futhermore, a school like Long Island City High School with a utilization rate of 151% and a senior class 72% white grants only 30% of its graduates academic diplomas while James Monroe in the Bronx with a higher utilization rate of 159% and a 41% white senior class grants 35% of its students academic diplomas.

One of the favorite excuses of the high school principals for the underachievement of graduating students is the overcrowding in their schools. This may be so, but it cannot be derived from empirical data. It may be true, however, that schools which are overcrowded and do grant a relatively high percentage of academic diplomas would do even better if the school were not so overcrowded. We do not suggest that overcrowding has no effect at all on academic achievement. We are only stating the facts of the matter to refute the traditional defenses used by principals when the extent of their school's failure becomes public knowledge.

A final word on overcrowding is that the five academic high schools granting the highest percentages of academic diplomas in the city had utilization rates (highest % of academic diplomas first) of 135%, 120%, 145%, 118%, and 134%.

ENROLLMENT VERSUS ATTENDANCE

It has been suggested by Mrs. Freida Josephs of Brooklyn Equal, that the actual attendance figures rather than the enrollment figures of each class at each high school would more accurately reflect the reality of overcrowding. These figures are not presently available to the public. They might show however, that some of the staff "teaches" classes so small that individualized instruction is possible without great amounts of additional Federal funding. If this information were made public, parents might begin to ask pertinent questions such as:

1. Why do students cut certain classes?

2. Should there in fact be high schools where actual class size is relatively small, or classes combined as they are in junior high schools? Mayor Lindsay might be particularly interested in this question since he is so worried about city payrolls this year.

3. Are the students who do attend these unofficially small classes benefiting from their size? Are they the ones who receive the academic diplomas?

A WORD ABOUT BROOKLYN

Brooklyn is probably the most interesting borough in terms of how the high schools perform. As usual, white communities like Bay Ridge and Bensonhurst get short changed. Their high schools have the highest percentages of white students and yet have the lowest percentages of students receiving academic diplomas. The black and Puerto Rican community receives even worse treatment. In 1968, Boy's High whose students are 99% Black and Puerto Rican came out with only 36 out or 272 (or 13%) candidates for graduation receiving academic diplomas. In 1970 only 30 out of 268 or 11% of the students received academic diplomas and the possibility of a college education. At Thomas Jefferson

where the student population is nearly 60% black, 35% (just more than 1 out of 3) of the graduates received academic diplomas in 1968. In 1970 the school had 24% (fewer than 1 out of 4) of its graduates receiving academic diplomas, which represents a drop of 11%.

At Fort Hamilton where 85% of the graduating class is white, only 30% of the graduates receive academic diplomas. Similarly at Bay Ridge High School which has a senior class that is almost two-thirds white, barely 1 out of 4 receives an academic diploma. But high schools with high percentages of Puerto Rican students come out worst of all. For example, Eastern District whose general student population is 60% Puerto Rican, has a senior class which is only 47% Puerto Rican and only 14% of the graduates receive academic diplomas. Those kinds of facts prompt us to wonder what the Board of Education and the U.F.T. really do with all that Title I money in programs like More Effective Schools, College Bound, and College Discovery.

A WORD ABOUT MANHATTAN

The Manhattan High Schools in general are among the worst, academically speaking, in the city. Only about 27% of the candidates for graduation receive academic diplomas. Schools like Benjamin Franklin and Haaren with substantial numbers of black and Puerto Rican students have graduating classes where only 13% and 17%, respectively, of the students receive academic diplomas. Year after year such high schools perform so badly that we wonder how long it will take before society in general can no longer withstand the strain of 70% and 80% failure rates.

If New York City and the fabled Lower East Side ever was a "melting

pot" (where many of the schools' present teachers and their families grew up) it is more so now. Seward Park High School on the Lower East Side has a senior class make-up of 18% black, 20% Oriental, 24% Puerto Rican, and 37% white. Yet only 38% of the graduates receive academic diplomas. The most that can be said for the Manhattan High Schools is that George Washington High School gives 43.2% of its graduates academic diplomas.

A WORD ABOUT QUEENS

Queens came out the best with 54% (borough wide) of its candidates receiving academic diplomas. There are some notable exceptions such as Long Island City High School where the student population is 73% white and only 30% of the candidates received academic diplomas. Another exception is Grover Cleveland High School were 72% of the student population is white and only one-third of the candidates for graduation received academic diplomas. One of the possible reasons why high schools like Long Island City did so poorly could be that its principal, Mr. Hurowitz, is spending more time playing politics than he is spending with his teachers and students.

A WORD ABOUT THE BRONX

The high schools in the Bronx are characterized by the same failures that predominate throughout the system. The Bronx, however, has the singular distinction of having the highest percentage of candidates for graduation who were refused diplomas and certificates of any type. The school that granted the most academic diplomas in terms of numbers and percentages was Christopher Columbus High School which granted 405 or

49%. Morris High School ranked last with 15% of the candidates for graduation receiving academic diplomas.

A WORD ABOUT STATEN ISLAND (RICHMOND)

The high schools on Staten Island have the highest percentages of white students in the city. The senior classes range from 96.8% white to 85% white. The percentage of graduates receiving academic diplomas averages about 40%. There is growing concern on the part of the Borough's residents about this relatively low level of academic achievement. During June of 1969 there were several editions of the Staten Island Advance which carried major stories on the low achievement of the schools. The controversy started when a member of the Board of Education supplied the Staten Island Federation of PTA's with statistics showing the low level of achievement (performance) in the schools.

A PROVOCATIVE PERSPECTIVE

Sometime ago when Mr. Murray Bergtraum, now President of the Board of Education assumed the chairmanship of the Board's finance committee he informed the eight million people of New York City that under his direction the "costs" of the school system on a school-by-school basis would be made public. Although Mr. Bergtraum has been caught giving false information before, he may still not have learned that parents, taxpayers, and students want the truth. In two recent publications of the Board of Education, one "An Analysis of City Funded Per Capita Budgeted Costs and Staff Rations" and the second "Community District Profiles for 1969-1970"* all references to high schools were conspicuously omitted. As a matter of fact there is no Board of Education

publication that is available to the public which lists school-by-school financial data about high schools. This secrecy about the high schools prompts us to wonder just what is going on in the Office of High Schools.

The following item appeared in the November 5, 1970 Calendar of the Board of Education:

> "Training and using veterans in the New York City public schools is designed to provide intensive support for 50 Viet Nam era veterans serving in selected high schools as auxiliaries while attending the College Discovery program of the City University of New York. The 50 had participated in an orientation and special training program during their last few months in the U.S. Army at Fort Dix, New Jersey."

THE COLLEGE BOUND GRAVY TRAIN!

College Bound is a centrally operated, federally funded Board of Education program that operates in twenty-seven academic high schools throughout the city. In short, it is the MES model applied to high schools and as such is regarded as one of the "Darlings" of the U.F.T. The official Board of Education description of the program states the following:

> "The primary objectives of the program are to increase appreciably the number of eligible pupils who will earn college preparatory diplomas and be admitted into college, and to improve the quality of work of marginal pupils so that they may become thoroughly competent students."

---

*The Staff who prepared these documents (see * on preceding page) did a good job and these reports are the first of their kind in recent history. Mr. Bergtraum could serve the city well by enlarging and reinforcing the appropriate bureau.

The annual expenditure for College Bound in 1969 was $8,570,000 for 9,000 pupils, about $950 per pupil. It should be remembered that this $950 per pupil expenditure is supposed to be in addition to all other regular City Tax Levy, State and Federal expenditures. This year, 1970, the annual expenditure for this program has risen to $10,5000,000 for 10,500 students, or $1,000 per pupil. With this enormous additional expenditure one would expect to find indications that the program's objectives were being realized especially since College Bound has now been operational for several years.

On the following page all of the 27 participating high schools are listed comparing the percentage of graduates receiving academic diplomas in June, 1970 with those of June, 1968. The results of this comparison are staggering. Thirteen of the twenty-seven schools (about half) actually had a loss, that is, a smaller portion receiving academic diplomas after this enormous expenditure for two years running. The majority of those schools which did show some progress had gains of only 4 percentage points or less. The implications of this scandal require a more detailed investigation and audit which should be demanded by all taxpayers and parents.

Participating Schools:

	Percentage Receiving Academic Diplomas In		
	1968	1970	Change
1. Andrew Jackson	39%	38%	- 1
2. Bay Ridge	26%	27%	+ 1
3. Benjamin Franklin	9%	13%	+ 4
4. Boy's	13%	11%	- 2
5. Bushwick	21%	22%	+ 1
6. Eastern District	19%	14%	- 5
7. Charles Evans Hughes	30%	28%	- 2
8. Evander Childs	30%	31%	+ 1
9. Franklin K. Lane	23%	37%	+14
10. George Wingate	41%	33%	- 8
11. George Washington	48%	43%	- 5
12. Grover Cleveland	36%	33%	- 3
13. Haaren	7%	17%	+10
14. James Monroe	47%	35%	-12
15. John Jay	23%	15%	- 8
16. Julia Richman	26%	30%	+ 4
17. Long Island City	29%	30%	+ 1
18. Louis Brandeis	18%	19%	+ 1
19. Morris	7%	15%	+ 8
20. Prospect Heights	16%	19%	+ 3
21. Samuel J. Tilden	58%	55%	- 3
22. Walton	35%	41%	+ 6
23. Washington Irving	21%	20%	- 1
24. William Howard Taft	43%	32%	-11
25. DeWitt Clinton	47%	45%	- 2
26. Canarsie	50%	56%	+ 6
27. Midwood	64%	71%	+ 7

"THE FOLLOWING TABLES"

The following tables are divided into two sections, DG-1 to DG-5 and ER-1 to ER-5. The first group of tables refers to the number and percentage of diplomas granted June, 1970. This data comes from the Office of High Schools (see page). All of the high schools are listed according to the percentage of the school "white" with the "whitest" school first. There is a separate table for each borough. The second group of tables refers to the ethnic enrollment of each high school and their respective utilization rates. The schools are in the same order as on the first set of tables.

For the second set of tables (ethnic enrollment and utilization) we gathered data from two separate sources within the Board of Education. For this reason there are slight inconsistencies in the school, borough, or city-wide totals. The ethnic census data comes from the Office of Educational Program Research and Statistics and the utilization and school enrollment data comes from the Office of School Planning and Research. The discrepancies between the information supplied by each of these two fiefdoms within the Board of Education has been closing in the past few years and it should not be long before the Office of School Planning and Research brings itself into line with the Office of Educational Program Research and Statistics. The last pages of this document describe the organization of the Office of High Schools.

TABLE U-2

ACADEMIC HIGH SCHOOLS
COMPARISON OF THE 5 HIGH SCHOOLS IN EACH BOROUGH HAVING THE HIGHEST BUILDING UTILIZATION RATE WITH THE % OF ACADEMIC DIPLOMAS GRANTED
1969 - 1970 SCHOOL YEAR

	UTILIZATION	% OF SENIOR CLASS WHITE	% OF GRADS RECEIVING ACADEMIC DIPLOMAS
BROOKLYN			
Canarsie	166%	84%	56%
Bushwick	166%	31%	22%
Thomas Jefferson	162%	27%	24%
Fort Hamilton	148%	84%	31%
John Jay	148%	43%	15%
Midwood	145%	85%	71%
MANHATTAN			
Louis D. Brandeis	147%	10%	19%
Benjamin Franklin	143%	3%	13%
George Washington	140%	41%	43%
Seward Park	115%	37%	37%
Julia Richman	112%	25%	30%
QUEENS			
Long Island City	151%	72%	30%
Newton	149%	72%	52%
Forest Hills	135%	85%	75%
Jamaica	134%	74%	68%
John Adams	134%	74%	39%
BRONX			
Morris	175%	1%	15%
James Monroe	159%	41%	35%
DeWitt Clinton	134%	54%	45%
Theodore Roosevelt	130%	23%	24%
Christopher Columbus	125%	89%	49%
RICHMOND			
New Dorp	135%	97%	37%
Tottenville	122%	94%	42%
Curtis	100%	85%	41%
Port Richmond	90%	89%	41%

ACADEMIC HIGH SCHOOLS - BROOKLYN
DIPLOMAS GRANTED - JUNE 1970

TABLE DG-1

SCHOOL	TOTAL CANDIDATES FOR GRAD.	TYPES OF DIPLOMAS GRANTED ACADEMIC # %	GENERAL # %	COMMERCIAL # %	OTHER # %	TOTAL REFUSED
New Utrecht	623	238-38.2	251-40.2	58- 9.3	14- 2.2	62
Lafayette	1113	552-49.5	356-31.9	122-10.9	12- 1.0	71
Abm. Lincoln	864	547-63.3	210-24.3	72-8.3	4-	31
Sheepshead Bay	895	433-48.3	331-36.9	49- 5.4	5-	77
Midwood	754	534-70.8	106-14.0	76-10.0	-0-	38
Ft. Hamilton	704	216-30.6	292-41.4	46- 6.5	17- 2.0	133
Canarsie	1201	673-56.0	370-30.8	61- 5.0	7-	90
James Madison	955	540-56.5	222-23.2	40- 4.1	57- 5.7	96
F.D.Roosevelt	719	307-42.6	273-37.9	42- 5.8	6-	91
Sam J.Tilden	632	345-54.5	200-31.6	42- 6.6	7- 1.1	38
Erasmus Hall	1015	544-53.5	346-34.0	43- 4.2	-0-	82
Bay Ridge	441	117-26.5	232-52.6	61-13.8	5- 1.1	26
John Jay	457	70-15.3	309-67.6	17- 3.7	7- 1.5	54
F.K. Lane	652	239-36.6	277-42.4	55- 8.4	4-	77
Geo. Wingate	429	141-32.8	181-42.1	7- 1.6	20- 4.6	80
Bushwick	402	87-21.6	215-53.4	35- 8.7	31- 7.7	34
Tom. Jefferson	443	108-24.3	269-60.7	11- 2.4	-0-	55
Eastern Dist.	269	37-13.7	178-66.1	9- 3.3	7- 2.6	38
Prospect Hgts.	370	72-19.4	254-68.6	14- 3.7	16- 4.3	14
Boy's	268	30-11.1	174-64.9	-0-	8- 2.9	56
TOTALS	13208	5830-44.0	5046-38.0	860- 6.0	227- 1.0	1225-9.

ACADEMIC HIGH SCHOOLS - MANHATTAN
DIPLOMAS GRANTED - JUNE 1970

TABLE DG-2

SCHOOL	TOTAL CANDIDATES FOR GRAD.	TYPES OF DIPLOMAS GRANTED ACADEMIC # %	GENERAL # %	COMMERCIAL # %	OTHER # %	TOTAL REFUSED
Seward Park	580	213-36.7	205-35.3	17- 2.9	27- 4.6	118
Geo. Washington	594	257-43.2	250-42.0	25- 4.2	13- 2.1	49
Washington Irv.	546	109-19.9	285-52.1	25- 4.5	112-20.5	15
Julia Richman	455	135-29.6	259-56.9	12- 2.6	17- 3.7	32
Haaren	260	45-17.3	155-59.6	-0-	3- 1.1	57
Chas. E. Hughes	265	73-27.5	145-54.7	-0-	24- 9.0	23
Louis Brandeis	601	114-18.9	387-64.3	5- o.9	9- 1.4	86
Ben Franklin	336	43-12.7	222-66.0	-0-	23- 6.8	48
TOTALS	3637	989-27.0	1908-52.0	84- 2.0	228- 6.0	428-11.0

ACADEMIC HIGH SCHOOLS - QUEENS
DIPLOMAS GRANTED - JUNE 1970

TABLE DG-3

SCHOOL	TOTAL CANDIDATES FOR GRAD.	TYPES OF DIPLOMAS GRANTED ACADEMIC # %	GENERAL # %	COMMERCIAL # %	OTHER # %	TOTAL REFUSED
flushing	575	399-69.3	99-17.2	53- 9.2	1-	23
Bayside	877	571-65.1	226-25.7	42- 4.7	2-	36
Benj. Cardozo	940	703-74.7	142-15.1	41- 4.3	-0-	54
M. Van Buren	911	508-55.7	300-32.9	61- 6.6	1-	41
Far Rockaway	715	383-53.5	265-37.0	24- 3.3	11- 1.5	32
Forest Hills	889	667-75.0	183-20.5	19- 2.1	-0-	20
Wm.C.Bryant	865	319-36.8	418-48.3	79- 9.1	5-	44
L.I.City	489	145-29.6	281-57.4	27- 5.5	11- 2.2	25
Grov.Cleveland	657	217-33.0	304-46.2	67-10.1	13- 1.9	56
John Browne	874	518-59.0	256-29.2	70- 8.0	1-	29
Richmond Hill	571	218-38.1	257-45.0	59-10.3	6- 1.0	31
Francis Lewis	576	317-55.0	180-31.2	21- 3.6	7- 1.2	51
John Adams	707	278-39.3	266-37.6	96-13.5	-0-	67
Jamaica	788	539-68.4	194-24.6	38- 4.8	1-	16
Newton	859	443-51.5	277-32.2	46- 5.3	43- 5.0	50
Sp. Gardens	693	322-46.4	276-39.8	40- 5.7	9- 1.2	46
And. Jackson	414	157-37.9	206-49.7	19- 4.5	-0-	32
TOTALS	12400	6704-54.0	4130-33.0	802- 6.0	111-	653-5.0

ACADEMIC HIGH SCHOOLS - BRONX
DIPLOMAS GRANTED - JUNE 1970

TABLE DG-4

SCHOOL	TOTAL CANDIDATES FOR GRAD.	TYPES OF DIPLOMA GRANTED				TOTAL REFUSED
		ACADEMIC # %	GENERAL # %	COMMERCIAL # %	OTHER # %	
Chris.Columbus	828	405-48.9	315-38.0	66- 7.9	10- 1.2	32
Evander Childs	732	229-31.2	349-47.6	29- 3.9	17- 2.3	108
Walton	536	219-40.8	212-39.5	32- 5.9	23- 4.2	50
DeWitt Clinton	757	339-44.7	256-33.8	-0-	5-	157
Wm.H.Taft	553	179-32.3	266-48.1	39- 7.0	15- 2.7	54
James Monroe	746	263-35.2	352-47.1	31- 4.1	24- 3.2	76
T. Roosevelt	540	128-23.7	325-60.1	31- 5.7	10- 1.8	46
Morris	478	74-15.4	239-50.0	4-	81-16.9	80
TOTALS	5170	1836-35.5	2314-44.7	232- 4.0	185- 3.5	603-11.6

ACADEMIC HIGH SCHOOLS - RICHMOND

DIPLOMAS GRANTED - JUNE 1970

TABLE DG-5

SCHOOL	TOTAL CANDIDATES FOR GRAD.	TYPES OF DIPLOMAS GRANTED				TOTAL REFUSED
		ACADEMIC # %	GENERAL # %	COMMERCIAL # %	OTHER # %	
New Dorp	705	264-37.4	389-55.1	15- 2.1	-0-	37
Tottenville	357	149-41.7	161-45.0	29- 8.1	-0-	18
Port Richmond	658	270-41.0	323-49.0	32- 4.8	8-1.2	25
Curtis	472	193-40.8	220-46.6	34- 7.2	-0-	25
TOTALS	**2192**	876-40.0	1093-49.8	110- 5.0	---	105-4.7
CITYWIDE TOTAL	36607	16235-44.0	14491-39.0	2088- 5.0	759- 2.0	3014-8.0

ACADEMIC HIGH SCHOOLS - BROOKLYN
ETHNIC ENROLLMENT BY SCHOOL AND GRADUATING CLASS
CAPACITY OF BUILDINGS 1969-1970

SCHOOL	NEGROES # %	PUERTO RICAN # %	OTHER So.Am. # %	OTHERS # %	TOTAL ENROL-LMENT	SCHOOLS CAPACITY	UTILIZ-ATION %	OVERLOAD+ UNDERLOAD-
New Utrecht Grad.Class	339- 8.5 33- 3.4	30- 1.8 4- .4	24- 1.4 5- .5	3575-89.8 915-95.5	3982	2830	141	+1152
Lafayette Grad.Class	351- 7.5 58- 5.2	229- 4.9 18- 1.6	35- .7 7- .6	4054-86.3 1020-92.0	4695	3632	129	+1063
A. Lincoln Grad. Class	551-13.6 56- 4.8	124- 3.1 21- 1.8	-0-	3326-82.2 1073-92.5	4045	3043	133	+1002
Sheepshead Bay Grad. Class	678-15.7 104-10.7	82- 1.9 9- .9	-0-	3532-81.8 852-87.4	4318	3548	122	+ 770
Midwood Grad.Class	710-17.5 134-12.5	77- 1.9 17- 1.6	21- .5 4- .4	3221-79.3 909-84.6	4060	2389	145	+1066
Ft.Hamilton Grad.Class	449-11.7 50- 6.6	294- 7.7 42- 5.6	-0- 14- 1.9	3006-78.5 633-83.7	3830	2589	148	+1241
Canarsie Grad.Class	904-18.1 150-12.0	259- 5.2 41- 3.3	-0-	3796-76.1 1053-84.0	4986	2998	166	+1988
James Madison Grad.Class	916-19.4 83-8.4	212- 4.5 22- 2.2	23- .5 2- .2	3541-75.0 879-88.6	4719	3051	140	+1216
F.D.Roosevelt Grad.Class	829-23.8 145-18.4	143- 4.1 27- 3.4	-0-	2456-70.5 601-76.1	3482	3218	108	+ 264
Sam J.Tilden Grad.Class	1076-27.3 162-16.6	231- 5.9 30- 3.1	27- .7 8- .8	2581-65.6 770-78.9	3936	3235	122	+ 701

ACADEMIC HIGH SCHOOLS - BROOKLYN CON'T.
ETHNIC ENROLLMENT BY SCHOOL AND GRADUATING CLASS
CAPACITY OF BUILDINGS 1969-1970

SCHOOLS	NEGROES # %	PUERTO RICAN # %	OTHER So. Am. # %	OTHERS # %	TOTAL ENROLL-MENT	SCHOOL CAPACITY	UTILIZ-ation %	OVERLOAD+ UNDERLOAD-
asmus Hall ad.Class	2150-39.6 189-23.1	228- 4.2 16- 2.0	-0-	2853-52.6 592-72.5	5428	4478	115	+ 665
y Ridge ad.Class	608-24.0 71-15.9	544-21.5 78-17.5	100-3.9 9- 2.9	1243-49.0 279-62.6	2536	1595	95	- 85
hn Jay ad.Class	1324-26.8 172-26.5	1363-27.6 162-25.0	226- 4.6 26- 4.0	1970-39.9 278-42.9	4941	3334	148	+1607
K.Lane ad.Class	2585-53.0 406-46.4	682-14.0 132-15.1	69- 1.0 9- 1.0	1495-30.7 320-36.6	4875	4315	113	+ 560
o.Wingate ad.Class	1760-66.2 427-61.3	182- 7.0 19- 2.7	35- 1.3 4- .6	644-24.2 240-34.4	2658	2855	93	- 197
shwick ad.Class	1227-36.2 138-30.9	1293-38.2 155-34.7	103- 3.0 11- 2.5	753-22.2 138-30.9	3389	2041	166	+1348
.Jefferson ad.Class	2751-58.9 443-50.9	1298-27.8 193-22.2	35- .7 -0-	567-12.1 232-26.6	4667	2875	162	+1792
stern Dist. ad.Class	808-27.2 118-32.8	1794-60.4 170-47.2	81- 2.7 18- 5.0	271- 9.1 49-13.6	2972	1898	139	+ 739
rospect Hts. adClass	1854-66.7 257-636	660-23.7 105-26.0	65- 2.0 11- 2.7	182- 6.5 25- 6.2	2779	2536	110	+ 243
y's ad.Class	2315-88.2 618-92.9	283-10.8 42- 6.3	-0-	15- .6 5- .8	2626	2368	111	+ 258
	24185-29.4 3814-23.6	10008-12.0 1303- 8.0	844- 1.3 122- 0.3	43081-56.2 10863-67.0				

ACADEMIC HIGH SCHOOLS - MANHATTAN
ETHNIC ENROLLMENT BY SCHOOL AND GRADUATING CLASS
CAPACITY OF BUILDINGS 1969-1970

SCHOOL	NEGROES # %	ORIENTAL # %	PUERTO RICAN # %	OTHER So. Am. # %	OTHERS # %	TOTAL ENROLLMENT	SCHOOLS CAPACITY	UTILIZATION %	OVERLOAD+ UNDERLOAD
ward Park ad.Class	856-20.9 147-17.9	620-15.1 162-19.7	1402-34.2 195-23.7	67- 1.6 11- 1.3	1153-28.1 308-37.4	4098	2441	115	+ 362
o.Washington ad.Class	1428-32.2 240-28.5	36- 16- 1.9	1133-25.5 169- 2.0	625-14.1 75- 8.9	1213-27.3 343-40.7	4438	3177	140	+1261
sh.Irving ad.Class	1153-33.1 189-28.4	365-10.5 119-17.9	1228-35.3 216-32.4	142- 4.1 21- 3.2	592-17.0 121-18.2	3480	4262	82	- 782
lia Richman ad.Class	2118-45.9 197-38.9	65- 1.4 12- 2.4	1632-35.4 162-32.0	101- 2.2 7- 1.4	693-15.0 129-25.4	4610	3497	112	+ 436
aren ad.Class	724-33.5 86-26.1	109- 5.0 43-13.1	1013-46.9 125-38.0	102- 4.7 22- 6.7	211- 9.8 53-16.1	2159	2970	73	- 811
.E.Hughes ad.Class	1509-63.9 197-62.1	43- 7- 2.2	509-21.6 68-21.5	96- 4.1 11- 3.5	202- 8.6 34-10.7	2360	3044	68	- 984
Brandeis ad.Class	3221-61.2 561-57.1	58- 1.1 22- 2.2	1169-22.2 243-24.7	404- 7.7 54- 5.5	409- 7.8 102-10.4	5264	2687	147	+1270
n Franklin ad.Class	1612-43.6 191-44.7	-0-	1926-52.1 217-50.8	79- 2.1 5- 1.2	71- 1.9 14- 3.3	3699	2593	143	+1106
otal High School otal Grad.Class	13477-38.4 1808-37.0	1296- 4.2 381- 7.7	10012-29.4 1395-28.5	1616- 4.8 205- 4.0	4544-23.2 1104-22.5				

TABLE I X 2

ACADEMIC HIGH SCHOOLS - QUEENS
ETHNIC ENROLLMENT BY SCHOOL AND GRADUATING CLASS
CAPACITY OF BUILDINGS 1969-1970

SCHOOL	NEGROES # %	PUERTO RICAN # %	OTHER So. Am. # %	OTHERS # %	TOTAL ENROLLMENT	SCHOOLS CAPACITY	UTILIZATION %	OVERLOAD+ UNDERLOAD-
Flushing	225- 7.1	103- 3.3	97- 3.1	2682-84.9	3160	2683	118	+ 477
Grad.Class	66- 7.3	9- 1.0	29- 3.2	774-85.6				
Bayside	569-14.3	56- 1.4	18- 0.5	3311-83.3	3977	3256	122	+ 721
Grad.Class	65- 5.5	7- 0.6	8- 0.7	1101-92.8				
Ben Cardozo	715-17.0	31- 0.7	27- 0.6	3407-81.1	4201	3510	120	+ 691
Grad.Class	98- 9.7	2- 0.2	3- 0.3	904-89.1				
Martin VanBuren	705-17.5	36- 0.9	33- 0.8	3242-80.2	4040	3468	116	+ 572
Grad.Class	135-10.9	11- 0.9	8- 0.6	1077-86.8				
Far Rockaway	557-16.9	99- 3.0	-0-	2622-79.6	3294	2916	113	+ 378
Grad.Class	192-19.1	17- 1.7		790-78.8				
Forest Hills	609-15.9	51- 1.3	67- 1.8	3034-79.3	3825	2830	135	+ 995
Grad.Class	114- 9.7	16- 1.4	16- 1.4	1006-85.3				
Wm.C.Bryant	455-11.0	230- 5.6	189- 4.6	3171-76.6	4137	3608	115	+ 529
Grad.Class	56- 5.6	40- 4.0	37- 3.7	836-83.8				
L.I.City	331-12.5	174- 6.6	188- 7.1	1927-72.9	2645	1747	151	+ 151
Grad.Class	71-14.3	35- 7.0	25- 5.0	359-72.2				
G.Cleveland	843-23.0	142- 3.9	36- 1.0	264-71.9	3673	3075	119	+ 119
Grad.Class	168-21.4	24- 3.1	18- 2.3	571-72.7				
John Browne	852-24.4	72- 2.1	62- 1.8	2469-70.6	3497	3301	106	+ 196
Grad.Class	130-12.1	23- 2.1	19- 1.8	888-82.8				
Richmond Hill	724-22.2	200- 6.1	43- 1.3	2280-70.1	3254	2147	111	+ 245
Grad.Class	105-16.4	23- 3.6	5- 0.8	503-78.7				

ACADEMIC HIGH SCHOOLS - QUEENS CONTINUED
ETHNIC ENROLLMENT BY SCHOOL AND GRADUATING CLASS
CAPACITY OF BUILDINGS 1969-1970

SCHOOL	NEGROES # %	PUERTO RICAN # %	OTHER So. Am # %	OTHERS # %	TOTAL ENROLLMENT	SCHOOLS CAPACITY	UTILIZATION %	OVERLOAD+ UNDERLOAD-
Francis Lewis	720-28.4	12- 0.5	23- 0.9	1756-69.2	2536	2814	90	- 278
Grad.Class	200-26.6	4- 0.5	3- 0.4	536-71.2				
John Adams	1399-27.3	134- 2.6	40- 0.8	3532-68.9	5126	3096	134	+1038
Grad.Class	180-22.5	16- 2.0	7- 0.9	592-73.9				
Jamaica	980-24.0	144- 3.5	164- 4.0	2736-66.9	4090	3051	134	+1039
Grad.Class	168-18.7	22- 2.4	26- 2.9	667-74.2				
Newton	538-10.2	159- 3.0	914-17.3	3534-66.9	5282	3534	149	+1748
Grad.Class	86- 9.3	26- 2.8	126-13.7	662-71.8				
Sp.Gardens	1653-37.6	64- 1.5	27- 0.6	2637-60.0	4395	3301	133	+1094
Grad.Class	283-30.2	2- 0.2	5- 0.5	644-68.7				
Andrew Jackson	1736-55.8	131- 4.2	47- 1.5	1188-38.2	3111	3190	98	- 79
Grad.Class	263-49.9	20- 3.8	5- 0.9	239-45.0				
Total High School	13611-21.2	1838- 2.9	1975- 3.1	43492-71.9				
Total Grad.Class	2380-15.6	297- 2.0	340- 2.3	12149-80.0				

ACADEMIC HIGH SCHOOLS - BRONX
ETHNIC ENROLLMENT BY SCHOOL AND GRADUATING CLASS
CAPACITY OF BUILDINGS 1969-1970

SCHOOL	NEGROES # %	PUERTO RICAN # %	OTHER So.Am. # %	OTHERS # %	TOTAL ENROLL-MENT	SCHOOLS CAPACITY	UTILI-ZATION %	OVERLOAD+ UNDERLOAD-
ris.Columbus ad.Class	326- 7.1 77- 6.1	175- 3.8 48- 3.8	24- 5.0 -0-	4058-87.9 1121-89.4	4614	3697	125	+ 917
ander Childs ad.Class	1715-38.7 464-38.5	479-10.8 134-11.1	48- 1.1 5- 0.4	2183-49.2 597-49.5	4435	4049	110	+ 386
lton ad.Class	1043-28.2 140-20.1	1058-28.6 186-26.7	74- 2.0 5- 0.7	1484-40.1 347-49.9	3700	3435	108	+ 265
Witt Clinton ad.Class	2093-33.8 293-25.5	1557-25.1 215-18.7	84- 1.4 14-1.2	2411-38.9 617-53.7	6192	4633	134	+1559
n.H.Taft ad.Class	1705-40.9 256-35.2	1194-28.6 130-17.9	116- 2.8 11- 1.5	1122-26.9 323-44.4	4173	3648	114	+ 525
ames Monroe ad.Class	1368-28.3 239-25.7	1729-35.7 272-29.2	161- 3.3 29- 3.1	1554-32.1 381-41.0	4842	2912	159	+1730
Roosevelt ad.Class	2073-40.8 280-36.8	2117-41.7 288-37.8	132- 2.6 13- 1.7	711-14.0 175-23.0	5080	3910	130	+1170
orris ad.Class	1447-33.5 184-35.2	2730-63.1 322-61.6	109- 2.5 10- 1.9	33- 0.8 5- 1.0	4324	2286	175	+1718
OTAL HIGH SCHOOL GRAD.CLASS	11,770-29.7 1933-26.9	11,039-27.5 1595-22.2	748- 1.9 87- 1.0	13,556-40.0 3566-49.6				

ACADEMIC HIGH SCHOOLS - STATEN ISLAND
ETHNIC ENROLLMENT BY SCHOOL AND GRADUATING CLASS
CAPACITY OF BUILDINGS 1969-1970

SCHOOLS	NEGROES # %	PUERTO RICAN # %	OTHER So. Am. # %	OTHERS # %	TOTAL ENROLL-MENT	SCHOOLS CAPACITY	UTILI-ZATION %	OVERLOAD+ UNDERLOAD-
w Dorp	26- 0.9	15- 0.5	22- 0.8	2808-97.5	2879	2131	135	+ 748
ad.Class	5- 0.7	1- 0.1	13- 1.8	687-96.8				
ttenville	28- 1.5	48- 2.6	8- 0.4	1753-95.2	1841	1505	122	+ 336
ad.Class	11- 2.9	9- 2.4	2- 0.5	353-93.9				
rt Richmond	221-11.1	49- 2.5	10- 0.5	1702-85.7	1986	2205	90	- 219
ad.Class	65- 8.6	11- 1.4	5- 0.7	677-89.1				
rtis	287-13.4	52- 2.4	26- 1.2	1758-82.2	2139	2139	100	0
ad.Class	50-11.3	6- 1.4	6- 1.4	375-85.0				
tal High School	562- 6.7	164- 1.6	66- 0.8	8021-90.6				
tal Grad.Class	131- 5.0	27- 1.0	26- 1.0	2092-91.9				
	63605-27.4	24345-14.3	13627- 2.4	112,694-54.4	236,087			
TY--WIDE TOTAL	10,066-22.0	3603- 7.9	1848- 4.0	29,774-65.7	45,261			

TABLE EA 5

BOARD OF EDUCATION OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK
OFFICE OF INSTRUCTIONAL SERVICES
110 Livingston Street
Brooklyn, N.Y. 11201

March 2, 1970

TO ALL HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPALS

Ladies and Gentlemen:

The Office of High Schools has been reorganized as follows:

ASSISTANT SUPERINTENDENT JACOB B. ZACK, COORDINATOR
Executive Assistant: Isadore J. Feuer
Room 826, 110 Livingston Street. Telephone: 596-6102-3

Directly in charge of John Dewey High School (only)

ASSISTANT SUPERINTENDENT JAMES BOFFMAN
Executive Assistant: Samuel H. Halperin
Room 514, 131 Livingston Street. Telephone 596-5484

In charge of all the academic and vocational high schools in the borough of Manhattan as follows:

Benjamin Franklin
Charles Evans Hughes
George Washington
Haaren
H.S. Music and Art
Julia Richman
Louis D. Brandeis
Seward Park
Stuyvesant
Washington Irving

Art and Design
Central Commercial
Chelsea
Food and Maritime Trades
Fashion Industries
Mabel Dean Bacon
Manhattan Voc-Tech
New York School of Printing

ASSISTANT SUPERINTENDENT STUART C. LUCEY
Executive Assistant: Herbert J. Klein
Room 808, 110 Livingston Street. Telephone 596-6242-3

In charge of all the academic and vocational high schools in the borough of the Bronx as follows:

Adlai Stevenson
H.S. of Science
Christopher Columbus
De Witt Clinton
Evander Childs
James Monroe
Morris
Theodore Roosevelt
Walton
William Howard Taft

Alfred E. Smith
Grace Dodge
Jane Addams
Samuel Gompers

ASSISTANT SUPERINTENDENT ABRAHAM WILNER
Executive Assistant: Carl Berlin
Room 806, 110 Livingston Street. Telephone: 596-6240-1

In charge of all the academic and vocational high schools in the borough of Queens:

Andrew Jackson
Bayside
Benjamin N. Cardozo
Far Rockaway
Flushing
Forest Hills
Francis Lewis
Grover Cleveland
Jamaica
John Adams
John Bowne
Long Island City
Martin Van Buren
Newtown
Richmond Hill
Springfield Gardens
William Cullen Bryant

Aviation
Jamaica Voc.
Queens Voc.
Thomas A. Edison
Woodrow Wilson

ASSISTANT SUPERINTENDENT (ACTING) OSCAR DOMBROW
Executive Assistant: Philip Kass
Room 818, 110 Livingston Street. Telephone: 596-5882-3

In charge of the following high schools in the borough of Brooklyn:

Bushwick
Canarsie
Erasmus Hall
Franklin Delano Roosevelt
Franklin K. Lane
George W. Wingate
James Madison
Midwood
New Utrecht
Prospect Heights
Samuel J. Tilden
Sheepshead Bay
South Shore
Thomas Jefferson

Alexander Hamilton
Clara Barton
East New York
William H. Maxwell

ASSISTANT SUPERINTENDENT (ACTING) JOSEPH L. BRENNAN
Executive Assistants: Milton Hochron and Jacob Leiter
Room 812, 110 Livingston Street. Telephone: 596-6244-5

In charge of all the academic and vocational high schools in the borough of Richmond and the schools not otherwise assigned in the borough of Brooklyn:

Richmond: Curtis
New Dorp
Port Richmond
Susan E. Wagner
Tottenville

McKee

Brooklyn:

Abraham Lincoln
Bay Ridge
Boys
Brooklyn Technical
Eastern District
Fort Hamilton
John Jay
Lafayette

Automotive
Eli Whitney
George Westinghouse
Sarah J. Hale
William E. Grady

Very truly yours,

SEELIG LESTER
Deputy Superintendent

SL:AIG:hm